THE SCIENCE OF PEACE

JX1952
.B87

By
Philip Marshall Brown

Library of The Theological Seminary
PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

FROM THE LIBRARY OF THE
REVEREND JOHN ALEXANDER MACKAY
LITT.D., D.D., LL.D., L.H.D.

JX1952
.B87

President John Hackney

Bridgebuilder

With kind friendly regards

Yours Philip Brown

Washington

5th June 1942

THE SCIENCE OF PEACE

THE SCIENCE OF PEACE

by

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
DEC 9 1968
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

NEW YORK
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, MCMXLII, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

All rights reserved; no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission from the Publisher, except by a reviewer desiring to quote brief passages for inclusion in a notice to be inserted in a newspaper or periodical.

Printed in the United States of America

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
London: 99 Averley Road

PAX OMNIUM RERUM TRANQUILLITAS
ORDINIS

INTRODUCTION

SCIENCE has greatly increased the comforts and the pleasures of life but it has also greatly increased the dangers of life. It has placed immense power, in the form of automobiles, airplanes, guns, and bombs, in the hands of children and criminals alike. It has made it possible for the few to terrify and enslave the many. Democracy has thereby been gravely menaced. Man has not mastered science. He has created a monster which he has not yet been able to control.

The modern science of war has become so exact and so efficient as to threaten to destroy civilization itself. If there is no science of peace the future is hopeless. The friends of international law and order must do much more than denounce the horrors of war and the savagery of mankind. It is not enough to advocate good will, justice, and international agreements, or to trust in cleverly devised systems and institutions. In time of world anarchy and general pessimism we must offer sound bases for a better world order. To prepare for peace in time of war is always urgent, but never more so than now in order to be ready for the grave responsibilities of postwar organization.

I have attempted in this little volume to suggest some of the principles which would seem to apply in the science of peace. I do so in the faith and the ardent conviction that a common unifying objective

can be found for the scattered portions of the family of nations.

The first five sections of this book appeared originally in *World Affairs,* the official organ of the American Peace Society.

P. M. B.

Washington, D. C.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Science of Peace	11
Peace at Home	21
Peace in the Home	25
Peace in Industry	29
Class Warfare	34
Interracial Peace	41
Peaceful Democracy	44
Education for Peace	48
The Church and Peace	52
Planning for Peace	56

THE SCIENCE OF PEACE

NIETZSCHE says: "Man is something that must be surpassed." It would seem that man has now been surpassed by modern science. He is not only grateful for the comforts and enjoyments which science has given him; he is its docile creature. He is even beginning to believe that social redemption will be achieved solely through science.

The tragedy of science is that its main trend has been towards the perfection of power and force. The intrusion into the private life of the atom has been animated largely by the desire to measure its energy and exploit its explosive power.

The supreme expression of modern science is the war machine. But once this machine is set in motion it soon gets out of control. The god of the machine takes command. It runs wild, destroying men, nations, and vast material resources. It also destroys cherished institutions and standards of values. Confusion of thought, and worst of all, destruction of moral character, follow in the wake of this Frankenstein monster which science has created. Men lose their mental equilibrium. They cannot anticipate and discount the course of events. The war machine rolls ruthlessly on. Civilization reels and chaos threatens.

The war machine has no respect for democracies. They can defend themselves against dictatorships only by being less democratic. The organization of democ-

racy for war demands great concentration of power and serious limitations on freedom. All the resources of the state, human as well as material, must be surrendered to the government. State capitalism results, and in turn produces social revolution. The masses of the people become restless and readily susceptible to subversive influences. A war between nations breeds social revolutionaries.

Under such disintegrating conditions created by the war machine it is obviously impossible to plan intelligently for peace. We do not know on what kind of foundations we may restore the temple of peace. We cannot be sure that the present war may not prove to be only one of a long series. Definite plans for international organization at the present time are futile. They are as derisive as small fountains playing in a deluge.

* * *

What then can the advocates of peace hope to accomplish in this hour of world tragedy? We cannot acknowledge defeat and remain silent. The lighthouse is most needed in darkness and storm. We must hold the faith and fight on. But not blindly. Not with empty phrases and slogans. Our immediate duty is to dedicate ourselves anew to the apparently insoluble problem of international peace. We must do so in a scientific spirit. The science of power expressed by the war machine must be opposed by the science of peace.

Now science in its essence is nothing else than knowledge. And knowledge is gained by realistic logical processes of thought. We are warranted in believ-

ing that through honest research comparable to the investigations of modern science we may discern the principles that control this science of peace.

The reasonable approach to this problem would seem first to recognize the errors and failures of previous experiments in the laboratory of peace. The lamentable experience of the League of Nations, in particular, should have most important lessons for us. There must be no emotional wishful thinking. Too much of fateful import to humanity is at stake. We are engaged in a scientific research infinitely more significant than the study of the atom.

The basic error in the peace experiments would seem to have been a false analysis of the causes of war and in the methods proposed to end war. And this error, strangely enough, has been due to the very same error that created the war machine. Both have been produced by a materialistic, mechanistic age. Both have been dominated by a blind belief in force. Both have believed that men can be coerced to behave as desired by gangsters, statesmen, and reforming idealists alike.

The peace advocates have placed their faith too much in institutions, in organizations, and in systems of government. They have persisted in the ancient error that men can be compelled to coöperate and live at peace with one another. The logical goal of this school of thought has been the creation of a gigantic international peace force to impose peace on single nations and on blocs of nations.

The peace movement has been obsessed by this faith in force, in the inexorable power of the machine. It found feeble expression in the attempt to apply economic sanctions against Italy at the time of the in-

vasion of Ethiopia. The League of Nations when used as a means of coercion collapsed miserably in dealing successively with Japan, Germany, Italy, and Russia.

No lesson in recent times could be more impressive and poignant than that the way to peace does not lie along the road of force. The god of the war machine can never ensure peace. Whether in personal, domestic, or international relations, mankind will always abhor coercion of any kind, be it physical or moral. You may win a temporary and a precarious peace by force but you cannot *reason* with men by force.

* * *

A most serious mistake of the peace movement has been to urge peace because of the increasing horrors of modern warfare. This argument has been as unrealistic as it has been ignoble. Heroic men never shrink from any call of duty because of the fear of suffering and death. It is an inspiring tribute to the character of the men facing the horrors of hell in Europe and the Far East that they have not faltered in the defense of what they believe to be sacred rights and obligations. The appeal to fear has sadly discredited the peace movement. It has paralyzed normal thinking and obscured the distinctions between right and wrong. Men who are defending their hearth and home value duty and honor above life itself. The span of life is all too brief, but men still believe in eternal values. They will not be deterred from laying down their lives for others by fear of the horrors of war.

Another error of the peace advocates has been to stress unduly the idea that wars are caused by a

"state of mind." It is true that wars result from a state of mind and emotion. Men do have profound convictions, be they right or wrong, concerning the justice of their cause. They think in terms of national interests, of pride of race, of religious freedom, and of material needs. They plan wars deliberately for the sake of their convictions, whether high or low, reasonable or fantastic.

Calling this a state of mind does not serve to clarify the problem. It requires much more than denunciation, derision, or argument. The fervid belief of the German people in a pure race which shall dominate Europe cannot be eradicated by either war or ridicule. The British interest in Gibraltar and Singapore; the demand of Italy for greater economic freedom; the claim by Japan for predominance in the Far East—these all must be considered realistically. Such issues disclose something much deeper than an emotional state of mind. They reveal the motives that inspire and control the actions of men and nations. We must know the philosophy of life that determines conduct. We must know the compelling motives that make men selfish or generous, cruel or kind. What most matters in the science of peace is the basic philosophy that actuates the conduct of men and nations.

* * *

It is painfully apparent that our present civilization too long has been dominated by a materialistic, mechanistic attitude of mind. The hard and dangerous work of society has been done, not because men and women wanted to, but because they had to. Society has been strangely indifferent to many social

and economic injustices. The economic law of necessity has prevailed over the law of love. It is easy to understand why the economic determinists have so profound affected the thinking of all ranks of society, including many social welfare workers and members of the clergy. They rightly believe that modern scientific discoveries should make human existence more comfortable and enjoyable. They believe that men will cease to be miserable and rebellious if economic injustices are corrected. This, they hold, is the right way to find peace.

The leading exponents of this philosophy of life are the Marxian socialists. Their idealism may not be questioned, though their class hatred and their methods lay them open to serious criticism. The inherent vice of this philosophy is that it restricts man within the narrow limits of economic determinism. They believe that man is merely the product of his economic environment. It is essentially a materialistic attitude towards life. In common with less radical reformers they would solve social and economic problems by legislation, institutions, and systems. They are substituting one mechanism for another. They would submit man to external controls of a different nature. The freedom they seek is economic. They have slight regard for his intellectual freedom and none for his religious freedom. Such a philosophy of life is too restricted to satisfy his whole nature.

This philosophy of life is also vitiated by its failure to take into account the conflicting desires of men. It ignores the greed, the lusts, the hatreds, as well as the ideals, that animate and control human conduct. It is based on the false assumption that these desires

and motives can be regimented by clever regulations and mechanistic systems devised by the state. In his instinctive search for complete freedom man has never been willing to submit to a social control over his desires and ideals.

The ultimate problem in the science of peace is to discover how the desires that control human conduct, whether in the family, in industry, politics, or international affairs may be reconciled and guided into right channels. If these desires are irreconcilable; if men and nations are resolved to take by any means, fair or foul, what they feel entitled to, there is no use in attempting to seek peace by the arbitrary use of force. You may secure a temporary semblance of peace by force but you fail ignominiously to eradicate the basic cause of war.

* * *

The advocates of peace through justice are now facing the stark, ugly reality that civilization is rapidly reverting to the law of the jungle. Our materialistic philosophy has been tending more and more to the idea of the survival of the strongest. Disguise it as you will, it is present everywhere, in business, industry, politics, and saddest of all, even in the church, wherever men find it possible by a sufficient show of strength to gain their ends by means other than reason and moral suasion. There is evident a general cynicism that makes light of ethical standards. We are aware of a prevalent social attitude that demands privileges but denies obligations. The freedom men seek is in the main individualistic and irresponsible.

The plight of the liberal in these times is most

tragic. A sense of defeatism and the inadequacy of his convictions make him inclined too often to compromise, to accept restraints and restrictions imposed by both doctrinaires and dictators. He is in desperate need of a fresh renewal of faith in what Walter Lippmann has termed "freedom of personality and inviolability of the soul of man." He cannot be content with any human institutions and devices which, in aiming at social betterment, actually fetter mankind with restrictions on the freest development of his highest nature. He knows very well that the legitimate desires and ideals of men can never with safety be restrained by any schemes of social reform.

* * *

What, then, is the solution of this problem of peace? Are we to confess ourselves hopelessly defeated? Must we accept fatalistically the prospect of unceasing contentions and wars? If that be our answer, we might as well eat, drink, and be insanely merry before the resounding crash of civilization. But if we are committed in our personal lives to a philosophy that can give contentment, alter profoundly the desires of men, and reconcile them, then we have an adequate answer which we must proclaim resolutely with undaunted faith.

But this will exact much more from us than intellectual conviction or moral dedication. We must first demonstrate in our own lives, in every relationship both within and without the family, those standards of behavior which we believe should control the actions of other men and nations. We should acknowledge the simple painful truth so fully expressed many years

ago, "Whence come quarrels and conflicts among you? come they not from your uncontrolled desires that contend within you?" It is axiomatic that, if we cannot have peace at home or in our other relationships, we cannot expect it between nations. This demands immense discipline and sacrifice. We would much rather seek external controls on human conduct than inner compulsions. We would resort to resolutions, petitions, denunciations, legislation, and punishments to constrain men to keep the peace. But this is to continue the old discredited fight between conflicting philosophies of life, whether Marxism, capitalism, collectivism, or any other form of social reform. The fight is most clearly drawn between materialism and idealism, between those who deny and those who affirm the right of man to freedom of personality and the inviolability of his soul. All other warfare has but little meaning beside this unending battle. Either we must thoroughly alter and reconcile the conflicting desires of men or abandon the fight for world peace.

* * *

How can these desires be altered and reconciled? How can they be harmonized into one sole objective, one supreme goal, one great faith to animate and satisfy mankind? If we have the courage of our convictions and the willingness to sacrifice something the answer may not be as difficult as we imagine. The only adequate, rational, unifying philosophy must be our faith in the actual brotherhood of man and the ultimate spiritual purpose of social evolution. Paul, the first of the great internationalists, proclaimed this truth to the skeptics on Mars Hill. "God hath made

of one blood all nations of man to dwell upon the face of the earth, and hath determined the periods and the bounds of their habitation." Rejecting the paltry philosophy of the materialists, we must hold to the faith that there is a divine plan of evolution that promises the utmost freedom of personality and the complete inviolability of the soul. We cannot be content with lesser and baser objectives.

I am not pleading for any sectarian creed. Each must be loyal to his own convictions. I am challenging those millions of Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Mohammedans, and all others who accept the authority of God in human affairs to present a militant, united front to promote the only kind of righteousness that can insure peace throughout the world. Such a united front would be irresistible. As President Roosevelt has so eloquently said, "There is no problem, social, political or economic, which would not melt before the fire of a great spiritual awakening." This is the true science of peace which can triumph over the science of war.

We are definitely challenged to dedicate ourselves to this crusade to lay the foundations for a sound and enduring peace. After all the yearnings, the strivings, and searchings after peace, we must take up the task in a venturesome pioneering spirit.

"All the past we leave behind:
We take up the task eternal, and the burden, and the lesson!
Conquering, holding, daring, venturing, as we go the unknown ways—
Pioneers! O pioneers!"

PEACE AT HOME

CERTAIN words have a colorful and hypnotic power, as poets and orators well know. They allure and control thought rather than serve as accurate instruments. They exercise what Stuart Chase has well termed a "tyranny." They evoke fancies, visions, emotions and illusions. They transport one into dithyrambic ecstasies and expansive generalizations. They become the insidious enemies of exact reasoning and obscure the truth. Among such words are liberty and freedom, which are sung lyrically and used sonorously in flights of eloquence. Democracy is a much abused word now the fashion. Other ill-defined words are *capitalism, socialism, mysticism, spiritual, faith,* and *truth* itself. They are often invoked as having an intrinsic value of their own. They are rarely defined with precision: they would then lose their colorful and hypnotic power. There is an unworthy security in vagueness and generalization.

Of all words loosely employed for various ends the word *peace* has ever had a special fascination for poets, priests and orators. It is seldom defined clearly and intelligently. Definition, however, is imperatively needed if we are to accomplish anything practical for the cause of peace. Webster's dictionary affords helpful suggestions:

"1. A pact or agreement to end hostilities. 2. A state of

tranquility or quiet; especially: a. Freedom from civil disturbance or war. b. Public order or security, as provided by law; as, a breach of the *peace*. 3. Harmony in personal relations; mutual concord. 4. Freedom from fears, agitating passions, moral conflict, etc."

In international affairs peace usually denotes the cessation or absence of war. It is thus of a negative character when so defined. It is not dynamic and creative. It does not suggest that men have positive obligations. For this reason many timid souls who dread violence in any form, think of peace in a cowardly manner, as desirable at any cost, even of justice and honor. This attitude of mind finds ignoble expression in the colloquialism "anything for a quiet life."

* * *

The peace movement has been seriously discredited by the unwillingness to define terms with fearless exactitude. Men have talked much of peace but have preferred to regard it as an aspiration rather than as a result to be achieved by intelligent effort and personal sacrifice. Those of us who dare, in this time of world disorder, to talk and work for peace must have the honesty and the courage to define the peace objectives in concrete terms. We must be ready to acknowledge the positive, the difficult, and—at times—the dangerous duties imposed on us if we are to "seek peace and ensue it."

No definition of peace has been offered as simple, comprehensive, and satisfactory as that given by Saint Augustine: *"tranquility of order," Pax omnium rerum, tranquillitas ordinis.* This is not merely a definition; it is an inspiring challenge. It implies the necessity

for justice as the basis of order. There can be no tranquillity where there is injustice and disorder. There can be no order unless men are willing to act justly and work for an orderly state of society. Peace cannot be had by earnest desire or by a cowardly evasion of unpleasant obligations. It is not negative in the sense of the absence of disorder. It is something quite different. It cannot be imposed by legislation, by institutions, by political or social systems, by command or by force. Peace is that living state of society which can be created only by men and women of good will and sound character. It does not come from without but from within the hearts of men.

Peace begins at home. If there is no harmony in the home how can it exist in business, industry, or in any of the social relationships? But peace at home cannot be attained in a negative way by a truce or armistice, any more than between capital and labor, or between nations. Husband and wife, parents and children can make a peaceful home only by unity of desires and purpose. The clash of selfish desires, the poison of resentments and hates: these can be eliminated and transformed only by a change of heart, an inner act of will and self-denial.

The peace movement will never be effective until men accept this very simple but difficult truth, that peace begins at home, in the heart of every individual. All longings for peace in industry, in human relationships, and among nations are pathetically futile unless they spring from the vivid realization that tranquillity of order is first to be attained in the very soul of man. There is something grotesque as well as illogical in praying for peace among men when one has

not found it in one's own soul. There is no easy short cut to international peace. The road is hard and long, but the goal is worth the struggle and the sacrifice.

* * *

Peace cannot be had through incantations. We must face the practical task with immense faith and daring. When we contemplate the rising tide of hatred and crime throughout the world—in domestic relations, in industry, and in all human activities, we must have the honesty and the courage to face this embarrassing truth, that *peace begins at home.* Our mission is not of a vague, quixotic nature, embracing vast international horizons. We must start with these United States and strive for tranquillity of order in the domestic affairs of the nation. We must join forces with all noble souls who seek peace through justice and are willing to live justly. We must build the foundations of peace on sound moral and spiritual principles. We must know what we mean, and mean what we know to be the moral and spiritual elements that alone can create men and women of character. Nothing is really alien to our task. The peace which is tranquillity of order must begin at home. And the true homeland for all the great brotherhood of man is the realm of the spirit.

PEACE IN THE HOME

World peace depends in final analysis on whether one is at peace with the whole world. It is something that comes from within, not from without. It begins in the home. It manifests itself at the breakfast table. Life is nothing but a series of expanding relationships. What happens between husband and wife, between parents and children, with servants, employees at the office, in the factory, in sports, clubs, and discussions: these determine peace among nations. If one is impatient, greedy, resentful, unkind, cruel and vindictive in the home, how can one promote peace in business, industry, politics, or any other field of human relationships?

Antoninus Pius said that "one man estranged from another cannot but be estranged from mankind in general." Until we are able to understand and accept in our lives this profound truth we cannot expect to be of much service to the cause of peace. The problem, then, becomes excessively simple but at the same time excessively difficult. In all sincerity we may desire to be at peace with the world but feel completely baffled in a world full of greed, lust, and hate, with homes disrupted, and strikes, violence, murder, and war on the increase.

We may well feel discouraged, but the desire to seek peace is in itself worth much. We can at least make a start by attacking the immediate problems in the

home. Tense and trying family situations have to be faced with infinite wisdom, patience, and love. Are these painful situations not due primarily to selfish, arrogant, impatient and imperious egos, each seeking to gratify his own desires for comfort, pleasure, and success?

* * *

How can these conflicting desires be reconciled and peace attained? In some families a clannish loyalty and pride, or a fellowship of poverty and suffering may preserve the semblance of solidarity and harmony. But this is not peace; it may merely be a *modus vivendi,* a precarious truce. The common aim may be material gain and selfish enjoyment, and prove of dubious value, having the seeds of inevitable dissensions. Or the family objective may be a genuine concern for the welfare of others as well as for happiness in the home.

Whatever the dominating motive in a home, there still remains the basic problem how to find inner peace of mind in the midst of sickness, bereavement, adversity and catastrophe. From what source may one draw the wisdom and the power to keep serene and at peace with the whole world? Antoninus Pius on his deathbed gave to the soldier on guard the password *aequanimitas.* And the Prince of Orange had a favorite motto: "Tranquil amid the stormy waves": *saevis tranquillus in undis.*

How can this serenity and tranquility of soul be won? The answer must depend on our individual philosophy of life. Each has to find the solution by earnest and honest searching. For some it may be

through severe discipline and self-control, a kind of stoicism, the capacity to endure misfortunes patiently without complaint. It may be found by a code of ethics which men may learn and master with diligence. With others it may be attained by a native gentleness and kindliness whose source is unknown and uncommunicable. It may be by the Buddhist road of sacrifice and self-annihilation.

Whatever the way to tranquility and inner peace, it is not enough unless it can be shared and communicated. It is not the treasure of a hermit. There must be fellowship, a common experience, a single animating spirit. Peace cannot be had when men are merely seeking individual satisfaction, even though it be idealistic in nature. There must exist complete unity of purpose and harmony of action, else there is no tranquillity of order in the home.

* * *

How can this unity of purpose and harmony of action be achieved? In an army intent on victory it can be had only by absolute submission to authority. Can there be any other way in a society of men intent on justice and peace? Must not their separate ambitions, desires, and their very ideals be fused into one sole aim and action? This would seem to be the essence of the whole problem of peace, whether between members of a family or between nations.

The supreme difficulty is to bring men to acknowledge freely and cheerfully a common authority. There must be no clashing of desires, opinions, ideals, and systems. At a time when the entire world seems to be lapsing rapidly back to the law of the jungle, the nec-

essity for a common authority is all too tragically apparent. We can save civilization from anarchy only by the subordination of personal desires to the sole universal authority that can make men unselfish and peaceful.

Whatever creed or sect may claim our personal allegiance, the great mass of mankind does acknowledge a common origin, a common brotherhood, a common creator, a common supreme directing intelligence, a "power not ourselves that makes for righteousness." The degree of success men achieve in attaining righteousness and tranquility of order is determined, in the main, by their acceptance of this universal authority which we call God. From this voluntary acceptance of one controlling authority flows that tranquility of order which is the foundation of peace.

Men learn how to become reasonable, considerate, generous, unselfish, coöperative and heroic. Instead of condemning and hating the sins of others, they admit their own. Costly restitutions are made and friendly relationships established. They know that peace literally begins in the home, and that there can be no world peace if one is not at peace with the whole world.

PEACE IN INDUSTRY

Strikes reflect an ugly temper of mind quite as much as genuine grievances. Everywhere are to be seen men and women parading the streets with placards denouncing employers as unfair and unjust. The great labor unions are at war with each other as well as within their organizations.

The actual merits of labor disputes are rarely understood by the public. All they know is that an enormous number of men and women are bitterly resentful and filled with hate, believing as they rightly do that there can be no peace so long as there is any injustice. Labor disputes are not much different from international disputes in that respect.

The right of men to protest and strike is obvious. No man can be compelled to work except as a slave or a prisoner. The development of the newer forms of strikes such as the "sitdown" strike and the "slowdown" strike has shown how futile it is to try to outlaw strikes. Only a totalitarian government such as Russia can commandeer labor.

The normal procedure to obtain justice is through conference, conciliation, mediation, arbitration, or judicial processes. But such procedure in these times of unrest and discontent is becoming more and more difficult. The rising tide of hatred in the ranks of labor militates against the dispassionate consideration of grievances. The situation is aggravated by the pres-

ence of professional agitators and racketeers whose personal interests are opposed to the peaceful settlement of disputes. And then there are the radical leaders who do not desire friendly relations between employees and employers. There are those who even advocate the sinister principle of "the acceleration of human misery" as the sure way to bring about revolution.

Those of us who are not immediately and directly involved in this industrial warfare are under the obligation to help create just conditions and a right temper of mind, rather than to take partisan attitudes in each dispute. We must try to judge sympathetically the conditions which have given rise to this lamentable state of affairs.

* * *

First of all, we must recognize that the rising tide of hatred in industry has its origins in centuries of wrongs and injustices. The men and women who have performed the menial, hard, and the dangerous tasks have not as a rule worked willingly and unselfishly. They have been driven too frequently by sheer economic necessity, by the need for food, clothing, and shelter. Their pressing needs have often been exploited by ruthless rulers and industrialists. The lust for power and the greed of wealth has exacted a fearful toll of human misery and suffering throughout the ages. The writer once saw with his own eyes a gang of Egyptian fellahin, as in the days of the Pharaohs, straining under the lash to drag a huge monolith down a main thoroughfare of Cairo. Many people can remember the time when laborers from the slums of Europe were

brought to America in cattle ships to be farmed out on railroad construction, or in mines and factories. The ships, the employment agencies, the "padrones," and the employers all profited by this traffic in human flesh. It may be alleged that the workmen also profited by relatively better conditions of existence than in Europe, but it is painfully evident that the whole process was a shameless one that had in it the seeds of sullen resentment and revolt.

Another general reason for the rising tide of hatred has been the war waged for generations by the labor unions to secure justice for these victims of economic necessity. There can be no doubt that but for the heroic leadership of men like Samuel Gompers many injustices would have been long ignored and unredressed. The right of labor to organize and defend individual rights by collective action, though entirely justified in its general aims, was recognized all too reluctantly.

The saddest feature of this long struggle was that it was real warfare, and that concessions won were often granted unwillingly and with bad grace. Too seldom did the industrialists yield voluntarily from a generous recognition of the justice of the demands. Large profits for the owners of industries, for the small as well as the big stockholders, had to be gained without much thought for the welfare of the workers or for their share in the profits.

The net result of this warfare, as in other kinds of warfare, could only be increased hatred and desire for revenge. The labor leaders have become imbued with the sense of dealing with an enemy. The rank and file of labor have looked to their union leaders as gen-

erals of an army fighting against predatory interests. And out of this warfare have emerged the hordes of radicals, socialists, communists, anarchists, as well as those liberals whose sympathies have gone out to the toiling multitudes who have carried civilization on their aching shoulders.

Civilization is now paying dearly for centuries of indifference, cruelty and crass stupidity. The masses of the people in every walk of life throughout the world have long been protesting that there could be no peace, whether in industrial relations or among nations, so long as injustices remained unredressed. The lovers of peace have fatuously been incanting peace when there is no peace.

* * *

It is clear that peace in industry is not to be had through violence. Nor is it to be had through any form of moral coercion or arbitrary methods. So long as men resent what they believe to be denials of justice affecting the basis of mere existence, there can be no enforced peace. Peace is not to be had by legislation, by the creation of new agencies and institutions. These are all mechanistic ways of dealing with a problem which is essentially moral and spiritual. That problem, we must iterate and reiterate, is an individual problem. It concerns human selfishness, greed, lust, cruelty, and hate. As long as men think only of their immediate desires they will be in constant conflict. While they hate they cannot be just. Without a common objective and a common authority they are bound to distrust and hate one another.

The lust for power and material things is not a

unifying objective. It is divisive. Belief in any system of reforms or institutions is not enough. Men will always contend for their opinions, even in good causes. An adequate objective can be had only in the acceptance of a common authority that claims complete allegiance and obedience. No human authority will suffice. There must be a universal authority. Such an authority may be had in a vague belief in a plan of social evolution which demands of men, as of ants and bees, service for the good of all. But men require a still higher incentive, belief in a spiritual process by which they can achieve perfect freedom of personality. And the highest conception of freedom of personality is, not in economic and intellectual freedom, but in the free expression and inviolability of the soul of man.

Labor is concerned not simply with subsistence, material comfort, and profit. These are but the means to greater freedom. In aspiring to freedom of personality and absolute respect for the soul of man labor can find industrial peace. But man must be seen as the offspring of a common creator, a supreme intelligence and authority whom all must obey. And this means the industrialist as well as the laborer. When each can conform to the will of God in the evolution of human society, he can then "seek peace and ensue it." Peace begins in the heart of an individual when all his desires conform to the divine plan. Peace in the home will inevitably follow, and in all human relationships. There are no problems which cannot be solved on this basis. When man first sees what is wrong with himself he can then right the wrongs of others. This is the only permanent solution to the problem of industrial peace.

CLASS WARFARE

DURING the Communist regime in Hungary in 1919 I protested to a young fanatical Communist because he was inciting the mob to wholesale murder by demanding the elimination of the bourgeois class. He replied that he was merely advocating good Marxist doctrines. I stated that the ordinary man could not easily distinguish between elimination and murder. As a matter of fact some of the prominent members of the Hungarian bourgeoisie were brutally murdered.

Bela Kun, the leader of the Communists in Hungary, once related to me how he had been roughly handled by the police prior to the revolution, and had his skull fractured. He said he merely remarked to the police that he hoped when their turn came they would take their beating as philosophically as he was taking his.

A century of the preaching of class warfare by Marx and his followers has resulted in a rising tide of hatred of alarming proportions throughout the whole world. Wherever there are labor disputes there are to be found fanatical advocates of violence and revolution. They are not seeking a just settlement of specific disputes but the overthrow of the whole capitalistic system. Their slogan is "the acceleration of human misery." Their aim is to increase ill will and hatred among men.

The Communists have been abetted unwittingly in

this vicious policy by many so-called liberals, including even members of the clergy, who, in their indignation over social injustices, serve only to increase class hatred that makes reform more difficult. There has been altogether too much indiscriminate and ungenerous denunciation of industrialists, capitalists, and "economic royalists." The rising tide of hatred is assuming immense strength of a menacing nature. In some ways it is more alarming than war between nations. When wars are over the general discontent and unrest they have engendered will serve only to foster social revolution and class warfare. Once hatred becomes deep-rooted, peace becomes impossible. Nothing can ever be settled permanently through hatred and violence.

The science of peace logically and inexorably excludes hatred as the basis of justice, whether between nations or between individuals. What, then, can we do to stem this rising tide of hatred and lay the sure foundations of peace? Many will justly answer that the unjust aggressor and criminal must first be resisted and punished. Others will insist with fervent conviction that the only way to overcome evil is through non-resistance in some such manner as Gandhi has advocated.

Irrespective of the merits of these two opposing ideas, there is an eternal principle that hatred can be supplanted by patient, generous understanding and brotherly consideration. The cynics, particularly the materialists, the mechanists, and the economic determinists, will scoff at any attempt to supplant hatred by love. They believe that nothing but stern repressive measures will suffice in dealing with social prof-

iteers and privileged classes. They have slight pity even for those who through industry, frguality, and superior intelligence have achieved a better economic status than others. In their zeal for social justice they would seem to be seeking to reverse the existing situation by substituting the greed of the "havenots" for the greed of the "haves."

A very able diplomat once stated to me that "men are beasts, and must be treated accordingly." When I asked if he meant there was no alternative to the law of the jungle, he replied that Christianity had failed and that there was nothing left except to fight it out with tooth and claw. I answered that if I believed this to be true I would eat, drink, and be insanely merry while civilization collapsed and reverted to barbarism and anarchy.

* * *

It is tragically true that Christianity has failed to bring about social justice and establish the rule of love. The world seems to be heading precipitately into a long era of violence, murder, and war. The great religions of the world are faced with a terrific challenge which they must either meet courageously or face extinction. The Russian example, where the Church failed miserably, is a fearful warning to those who believe that religion has the final answer to all of man's needs. It is painfully apparent that many men in their desperation and bitterness of hatred have become convinced that religion does not have an adequate answer to their needs. But they also appear to have lost faith in mankind as well as in God.

As we face honestly the whole problem of peace,

must we admit defeat and accept despairingly this hideous prospect of unending class struggle and war throughout the world? The desire for peace is obviously not enough. The resort to violence in order to end class warfare is obviously not enough. Another answer must be found and applied without delay if this world disaster is to be averted. That answer has already been suggested in general terms, namely, that hatred must be supplanted by generous understanding and genuine brotherly love. But how can this be accomplished in a practical way in time to save civilization from disintegration and ruin?

Mere ethical admonitions cannot suffice. Men are amazingly divided in their standards of right and wrong. Greed, lust for power, envy, and hate are in the ascendancy. There exists no commonly accepted standard of decency, no common authority which men will obey. Natural law, in its emphasis on rights and its failure to stress obligations, is too vague and weak. The appeal must be made to a higher law, the law of social evolution, the law of the freedom of personality and the inviolability of the human soul. That law can be understood only by those who recognize that the universe is governed by a supreme intelligence, by a single authority which by common consent we call God. Such persons are vividly aware of the presence of God in all human affairs and know that only His authority can control the behavior and the destinies of the human race. There are millions of such persons throughout the world: Catholics, Protestants, Jews, Moslems, Hindus, and men of other faiths, who in their own several ways, acknowledge allegiance to one divine authority. To such men and women we must

now appeal in our warfare against human greed, envy, lust and hate. Such a solid bloc of believers throughout the nations might accomplish the seeming miracle of peace through justice.

* * *

The problem of class warfare would not be difficult of solution by those who recognize their common origin and brotherhood, who believe in the dignity and worth of human personality, and who never can admit that hatred can solve human problems. The very terminology of "class" differences is abhorrent to all who truly believe in the brotherhood of man. It savors of pride and snobbery, of something false and abominable. The real differences between men are not differences of class but of character. A Roman citizen once asked in what respect was his Emperor "great": "Is he more just than I?" There are, of course, handicaps of heredity, of environment, of poverty, of bad education and moral instruction. There are those who are more "fortunate" than others. There will always be those who by sheer ability and character achieve excellence, but such men are under the compulsion of the higher law, *noblesse oblige.*

In any society where true religion is revered there can exist no class distinctions. Such differences as may exist are individual differences and must be treated accordingly. Poverty, vice, crime, insanity, and disease, as well as social injustice, are the proper concern of all members of a community. Religion alone, however, has the answer to the embarrassing question, "Who is my neighbor?"

In a truly democratic society there can be no "serv-

ant class." The very word servant in its origin in slavery and its long unpleasant history connotes something ignominious. Free men and women are unwilling to be so classified. Too long have they been compelled by sheer economic necessity to sell themselves for money. Another approach must be found to the relationship of those who work for others. A key to the problem is suggested by the terms used in various parts of the United States where this distasteful word servant is never used and those who work in homes and in the fields are called "hired help" or even "accommodators." These terms are most significant. They clearly imply another kind of relationship than that of servant. The basis is not simply wages but a friendly willingness to *help*. On this basis mutual services may be rendered which money can never fully repay.

Henry George, in *Progress and Poverty*, rightly stressed the fact that wealth is never self-created but made possible only by neighbors. A lonely inhabitant on an island may have all he needs physically but he has not wealth. He needs others to help him create wealth. This truth should profoundly alter all human relationships. Every workman, artisan, shopkeeper, shoemaker, doctor, lawyer, priest, and all skilled in trade and the arts, render services to a community for which money alone does not adequately compensate. Such services are mutual and deserve unfailing appreciation and gratitude.

Class warfare will be well on the way to extinction when men have this sense of mutual service and interdependence. The desire for wealth will be subordinate to the desire for helpful service. The harsh

and cruel pressure of economic necessity will yield to the realization that we are truly our "brother's keeper," that we are actually dependent on each other, that we share the same benefits and penalties of nature, that we enjoy similar pleasures, and await one common end. *Una sola mors; una sola spes.*

INTERRACIAL PEACE

The rising tide of hatred throughout the world is most alarming. The hatred bred by wars between nations is bad enough, but the hatred bred between classes and between races is infinitely worse. It leads to revolution or constant daily warfare. This hatred is venomously exploited by social revolutionaries who have no desire to encourage friendly and peaceful relations. The Jew and the Negro especially have been exposed to the most vicious efforts to arouse their resentments and hatred.

The world has never witnessed anything so diabolically cruel as the war begun by Hitler against the Jews in Germany, and spread by him wherever his power and evil doctrines may penetrate. And the ugly specter of anti-Semitism has arisen even in the United States. There can be no peace throughout the world so long as millions of Jews in many nations are suffering in spirit as well as in body. Wherever there is injustice there can be no tranquility of order.

The Negro in America is peculiarly susceptible to the vicious incitement to hatred preached by radical revolutionaries intent on the overthrow of what they term "capitalistic civilization." The Negro's lot is especially hard because it is but relatively a short while since he emerged from the African jungle. He is still under the stigma of belonging to an "inferior" race.

The door of opportunity is not open wide in many parts of the United States.

The heart of the Negro problem is not to be found in a demand for intermarriage with other races or for social admission. Eligibility for marriage or for social position is something which society as a whole cannot control. It is a question of individual concern, whether it affects Japanese, Indians, Latins, Scotch, Irish, Negroes, or Jews. There can be hostile class, or racial legislation in the United States.

Society can do much to mitigate the racial handicaps that stand in the way of equality of opportunity and respect for human personality. Laws can be enacted to prevent racial discrimination. Sentiment may be created to provide greater opportunities for employment and advancement. In final analysis, however, every man must stand on his own personal merits. It is not enough to denounce intolerance. It is not enough to demand equality before the law. There will still remain those formidable social barriers which can be broken down only by sheer force of individual excellence and character.

Again we must iterate and reiterate that the answer to all human problems of this nature is essentially personal. When a man discovers that he is not liked, he naturally should try to understand whether the fault is that of society or his own. He cannot overcome prejudice, selfishness, and hate by his own prejudices, selfishness, and hate. That is the progressive road to violence and the jungle. The faults he dislikes in others may be also in himself. If he himself is free from prejudice, selfishness and hate, nothing else very much matters. The power of a generous, sympa-

thetic, understanding affection is irresistible. No racial prejudice and hatred can long resist.

* * *

This may seem almost axiomatic but yet unattainable. Men, for the most part, despair of ever changing human nature. They are really defeatists at heart and assume that this weary, inharmonious world must drag along unchanged and unchangeable. But we cannot accept this defeatist philosophy. We cannot repudiate centuries of social evolution. We must cling to an innate conviction, which is often supressed and scorned, that all men are fellow creations of one supreme intelligence and authority to which we all owe allegiance and obedience. The "great denial" is the ignoble sin of denying our spiritual origin and divine destiny. Nothing else matters. Interracial peace and social reconstruction can come only through a spiritual revolution that destroys prejudice and hate, and creates a tranquility of order in which we can build a better world.

PEACEFUL DEMOCRACY

We boast that the will of the majority must prevail in a democracy and that everything is settled peacefully at the polls. This is true in a sense, but it is also a fact that often there may exist a discontented minority who bitterly resent the tyranny of the majority. The presence in any community of a considerable number of citizens who believe that individual rights are violated and insufficiently protected is certainly a menace to tranquility of order. We had painful evidence of this fact under the Eighteenth Amendment. Such a state of affairs can hardly be termed peaceful. The absence of violence is not a sufficient test of peace. A democracy may gradually disintegrate politically when resentments smolder and confidence disappears.

* * *

There is no inherent virtue in democracy or any other human institution. Virtue is a personal attribute, and democracy is only what individual men of character may make of it. The downfall of one democracy after another in Europe, beginning with Italy and Germany, must be recognized as of general significance. When men lose confidence in democracy as an institution and accept arbitrary leadership, it is a sure sign of the decline of individual virtue. They have lost faith in themselves. And faith in one's fellow

man is the very essence of democracy. It is the bedrock of tranquility of political order.

The reasons for this breakdown of the democratic system are many and complex, but may logically be simplified as of personal origin. When politicians and citizens generally are activated by personal greed, lust, envy, resentments, and hate, you cannot expect to have a peaceful democracy. In spite of outward friendliness, politicians come through political battles with wounds and bitterness that become manifest in factional opposition. When social welfare and national security are affected by personal antagonisms the results may be disastrous.

* * *

It is painful to have to acknowledge that human selfishness and egotism have played havoc with the democratic processes. Witness France, where the parliamentary system long ago became bankrupt and led to the nation's present collapse. The merits of a sound piece of legislation may be utterly obscured or misrepresented by reason of personal animosities. The results of political debate may be unworthy compromises that satisfy nobody. Such procedure may be productive of distrust and discontent. It tends to undermine popular confidence and public order.

When we have acknowledged all this we are inclined to accept fatalistically these defects as inherent and inevitable in a democracy. We console ourselves with the complacent belief that democracy is better than any other political system. While this may be true, it does not follow that these defects are necessarily inevitable. Democracy registers the average

level of the intelligence and the virtues of its members. Lower that level and the defects may become a menace to the very existence of democracy.

* * *

The vital question before us is just how can the level of intelligence and character of a people be raised to such a point that we can truthfully be satisfied with democracy? The answer is simple and exacting, "When each citizen raises himself to the level of selfless service." Your cynical politicians will ridicule this solution as being quite unrealistic. They say that human nature is essentially self-centered and controlled by the profit motive. Unselfishness to these cynics is just hypocritical nonsense. If they are right, humanity, then, is doomed to the struggle of the survival of the fittest and the strongest. But they are not right. Men in a democracy are seeking consciously or unconsciously the highest good of all its members. They see in others what they are themselves and what they may become. The freedom they ask for the development of their own personalities they concede to others. They acknowledge "one far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves." They work together under the dictatorship of the supreme authority which controls the evolution of the human race.

This is the aim of a peaceful democracy. But it cannot be attained either by denunciation or by exhortation. The elimination of greed, lust, envy, and hate is not by punishment, preaching, or even by education. It is an individual process, not a social, political, process. It depends on men's ambitions and desires, and this is an inner process. It exacts self-

examination to determine the standards of value which control one's behavior. It is essentially a religious act of humiliation, repentance, sacrifice, and dedication. Men attain this level best when they are conscious of their high origin and their membership in a noble order of humanity.

Democracy rests on respect for human personality—for the freedom and inviolability of the soul of man. Religion alone gives man a glowing sense of kinship and allegiance. *Noblesse oblige* is the guiding motto of a peaceful democracy. When statesmen and politicians and citizens in general cease to serve their own ends and obey the laws of nature and of nature's God, we will have a genuine democracy where peace is found through justice and righteousness.

EDUCATION FOR PEACE

The peace movement has passed through several stages. Its kindergarten stage, not so long ago, was to make people realize vividly the horrors of war and strip it of heroic glamour. No one has done that more poignantly than Baroness von Suttner in *Lay Down Your Arms,* a book which served the peace movement very much as did *Uncle Tom's Cabin* the cause of the abolition of slavery. It has not been difficult to demonstrate the horrors of modern war. They are being brought home to us all too vividly. It is not so easy, however, to eliminate the heroics of war, because the greater the horror, the greater the heroism of those who defend country and freedom.

* * *

The next stage of the peace movement was to arouse popular interest in the arbitration of international disputes. The Permanent Court of Arbitration, established at the Hague in 1899, held out high hopes for a few brief years. Then came the First World War, followed by the creation of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which also held out great promises for peace as part of a general scheme for world organization under the League of Nations.

* * *

For nearly twenty years attention was centered on

this great experiment of the League. It was believed by many that world peace could be secured by some form of coercion—either economic, military, or moral. This idea proved to be illusory and harmful, more productive of friction, distrust, and antagonism than of friendliness and conciliation. It gradually became apparent that world peace cannot be had either by coercion or by solemn agreements, such as the Kellogg Peace Pact. The ever present disturbing factor is that of the conflicting desires and passions of men.

* * *

The next, and actually the present, stage of the peace movement would seem to be the realization of the necessity of understanding these conflicting desires and to discover, if possible, the way either to reconcile them or to change them. There is a general realization that it is not enough to stress the horrors of war and to denounce the savagery of man. We are beginning to realize that, in spite of the increasing horrors of modern air warfare, men will still fight for the sake of firm convictions springing from economic, moral, or immoral motives. We see that the peaceful settlement of international disputes requires much more than agreements, courts or coercive sanctions. We are dealing with the basic motives that inspire and control the actions of men. This is not a purely economic, political, or moral issue; it is essentially a spiritual matter. How can we change these conflicting desires of men? How can we unite them in one adequate common objective under one common authority?

* * *

Here is where our modern educational system has broken down. It is no longer vitally concerned with moral or spiritual standards of value. Modern research, doubtless under the impulse and guidance of German scholarship, has become more and more a laboratory process, restricted in scope and in instruments. Its general scope is the belief that pure reason can be trusted to discover all truth. Its instrumentalities are the fallible faculties of the investigators. Once they rely completely on their intellectual microscopes, telescopes, and spectroscopes, they cannot greatly extend fields of investigation. Their conclusions are bound to be circumscribed.

The economic determinists, the mechanists, the behaviorists, and the humanists as well, all reveal the painful limitations of modern research. The Marxian research scholar boldly excludes all moral and spiritual values. Karl Marx once said, "With me, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought." The psychologist who deliberately excludes all subjective evidence in his laboratory experiments obviously cannot understand either the motives or the ideals that actuate human conduct. The professor of comparative religions, who, like Spengler, classifies creeds and mystical beliefs objectively, is bound to miss the very heart of religious experiences, exemplified by great mystics, such as St. Francis, Santa Teresa, and St. John of the Cross.

* * *

Our modern educational institutions are discouraging places for the training of youths in the knowl-

edge of the moral and spiritual forces of the universe. Instead of being temples for the worship of truth, they too often seem to be prison-houses of the mind. Methods of research are unscholarly because they deliberately exclude processes of perception and experimentation other than accepted laboratory methods. They have exalted reason and scorned the unexplored regions of the very soul of man.

This is why the peace movement, at its present stage of trying to understand the conflicting desires and passions of men, is encountering such disheartening difficulties. A succession of generations has been trained in purely mechanistic, materialistic, or humanistic conceptions of human psychology. They find it very hard to understand the motives of their fellow men, whether of their own, or of alien kin, except in terms of crass materialism or selfish power. They find it increasingly difficult to believe in spiritual power. They are not at all sure if there are spiritual implications in the great process of social evolution.

The most dangerous enemy of the peace movement is the intellectual defeatist who does not offer an adequate common objective or acknowledge a supreme common authority. He has no answer to the problem of the conflicting desires and passions of men. Nowhere is a great moral and spiritual awakening more urgently needed for the sake of peace than in our colleges.

THE CHURCH AND PEACE

Peace and religion have in all times been considered as identical. This has been especially true of the religion of Jesus Christ, who preached and exemplified peace in His life and in His death. Certain sects, notably the Quakers, have stressed the virtue of peace. The Roman Catholic Church often has thrown the great weight of its authority on the side of peace.

It must, however, be confessed that organized religion has been strangely ineffective in its labors for peace. One shudders to recall the various wars of religion which destroyed many lives and devasted a continent. Cromwell even boasted in his fanatical zeal that he had not left in Drogheda a single soul "to tend the altar lights." Charles Lever ironically characterized the Irish religious struggles in the biting phrase, "fighting like devils for conciliation, and hating each other for the love of God."

It is true, of course, that Church leaders have generally condemned the horrors of war and the savagery of man. But many of them also have become as militant and full of hate as any other patriot fighting against injustice. There have been distinguished preachers who for years inveighed eloquently against what they have called "the war system," only to discover later on, to their discomforture, that there is no *system,* but that there are international gangsters.

A large number of religious leaders have become

nonresistant pacifists and have greatly influenced the thinking of the younger generation. These "conscientious objectors" often are put to very severe tests, as in the case of the English students who took the oath never to fight again for King or country. In the face of danger and the demands for immediate action they must have wondered whether the preachers were right.

* * *

The peace movement has not had much practical aid from organized religion. In some respects it has been seriously hindered. Some preachers, in their indignation over social wrongs, have aroused even fiercer hatred between classes and gravely endangered that tranquility of order which is the very essence of peace. Organized religion has neither enlightened its adherents concerning the basic causes of wars nor demonstrated how they could achieve peace.

This failure of the Church, it is to be feared, has not been due so much to ignorance as to something much more deplorable. The Church not only has been party to wars and to the hate that engenders wars; it has not been at peace within itself. The unlovely spectacle of sect contending with sect and rejoicing in each other's misfortunes is bad enough but so also is the situation inside the sects. How many churches have had fierce theological duels and personal vendettas where clergy have been pitted against clergy, and their followers enlisted in bitter schisms! Anthony Trollope's fascinating and depressing story of *Barchester Towers* is no mere work of fiction. The Church has great need of taking to heart the prayer for:

"Peace in our hearts, our evil thoughts assuaging,
Peace in Thy church, where brothers are engaging."

* * *

How could the Church expect to accomplish much for peace when it knew not peace within? It seems blasphemous at times for the Church to pray for peace. What have its leaders done in their own lives to warrant pleas for peace? Have they or the rest of us deserved to escape the sufferings and penalties for our sins and follies? Intercessory prayers for a quiet and easy life often seem incongruous and presumptuous, completely out of harmony with the inexorable law that we must reap what we sow. Those who violate the laws of nature and of nature's God can hardly expect to escape punishment. And this must be tragically true of a whole nation of offenders.

We cannot presume to know the whole plan of social evolution. We are in the great procession of the ages and cannot clearly comprehend its direction. We do not know how much misery and tragedy the human race may have brought on itself by its own stupidity. We well know, however, that when a people become soft and self-indulgent, or arrogant and vicious, they are bound to suffer great trials. They should also know that it is childish and unreasonable to pray for peace. They must stand the consequences.

The Church now has a special responsibility in the fight for peace. It should be ready humbly to learn much from its errors and shortcomings. It must first seek peace within itself and among the various branches of organized religion. It must abase itself if it would minister to the peace of men's souls. It

must lead men along the road of selflessness and high devotion. It must return to the simplicity of the challenge thrown out by St. James:

"Whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence, even of your lusts that war in your members? Ye lust, and have not: ye kill, and desire to have, and cannot obtain: ye fight and war, yet ye have not, because ye ask not. Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may consume it upon your lusts. . . . Cleanse your hands, ye sinners, and purify your hearts, ye doubleminded."

PLANNING FOR PEACE

PEACE is not a static condition of society considered as the absence of violence and the cessation of war. It is a state of constant activity to create and to maintain that tranquility of order which is the foundation of all government. If eternal vigilance is the price of liberty, eternal planning is the price of both national and international order.

Never was there greater need of intelligent planning than in this time of international anarchy. The immediate task is to win the war. The ultimate and the eternal task is to "win the peace." Peace can never be won as a prize or held permanently. It must be labored for and be deserved.

We are conscious of the tragic fact that the First World War was a defeat for peace. The world was not made "safe for democracy." We now see the danger of the moral and economic catastrophe which may succeed the carnage and destruction of the present war. If plans for world reorganization are not prepared in time of war it may prove to be a fearful calamity should peace come suddenly and unexpectedly before we are ready to meet our responsibilities.

Our responsibilities for peace are commensurate with our responsibilities to help win the war. The sacrifices we must make in war will entail immense sacrifices in time of peace if we are to prevent the recurrence of another world war. We cannot afford

this time to leave to others the sole responsibility for postwar world reorganization.

Certain stark realities must be squarely faced. If the plans of Hitler and his accomplices for a "new world order" are to be thwarted they must be countered by plans for another kind of world order. This responsibility logically belongs to Great Britain and the United States. Anglo-American collaboration is the foundation of world peace. Other nations in turn will have to share ultimately this burden in some kind of association of nations, but the main responsibility must rest with the two great blocs of material and moral power represented by the British Commonwealth of Nations and the United States of America. Fortunately, groups of persons in all these countries have realized the urgency of preparedness for peace. A detailed program of postwar reorganization obviously is not possible, but certain general conclusions and principles are emerging on which to base a working agreement between Great Britain and the United States.

* * *

When the war ends, the responsibility for preserving international order will fall mainly on Great Britain and the United States. The ultimate defeat of Germany, Italy, and Japan will not be complete unless they are reduced to a state where they can never again menace the peace of the rest of the world. And this implies moral as well as material disarmament. We must be thinking how we can best meet this responsibility to serve as beneficent guardians of the peace throughout the world. How shall this duty be shared

with Great Britain? Who will be responsible for the peace of Europe, Africa, and Asia? It would seem clear that while we must maintain the peace of the Western Hemisphere, Canada as a member of the British Empire must also assume its responsibilities. It would seem clear also that the United States and Great Britain will have to share responsibility for peace and order in the Far East and the whole Pacific area. Those great strategic outposts for the freedom of the seas, Gibraltar, Suez, Singapore, Hawaii, Panama, and other places of vital importance for air and naval bases, such as Dakar and the Azores, must be held for the benefit of all nations. How this shall be accomplished is a problem for the military experts. They must rely on enlightened public opinion in the free democracies to authorize the sacrifices required for the stupendous task of maintaining international peace and order.

* * *

When peace has been restored, and international order guaranteed, the immediate pressing problem will be the economic reconstruction of those nations—including the Axis Powers—which may have been exhausted and ruined by war. We should be planning for freer and fairer trade based on a just division of the world markets; for the economic development of backward areas for the good of all nations; for the stabilization of international currency exchange, and the pooling of economic resources, including the use of the vast gold reserve of the United States for the rehabilitation of the countries ruined by a disastrous war. This highly specialized field demands an army

of economic experts to prepare well in advance for that dangerous moment when the war shall come to an abrupt end.

* * *

When the United States and Great Britain shall have agreed on their joint responsibilities for international order they should welcome into this partnership such nations as may have demonstrated their good faith and capacity to coöperate. The Netherlands, because of its colonial interests and the moral character of the Dutch, should be admitted early into an association of nations of this kind. The members of the Pan-American Union should doubtless be admitted to the association at the outset. It may require a long time before certain other nations can qualify for membership. The League of Nations should be revived and revised in the light of experience and the demands of a changing world order. Its machinery should be preserved and utilized for non-political purposes. The Secretariat of the League should be available for the many international conferences which will be immediately required to facilitate normal peaceful intercourse between nations.

* * *

We should plan for the perfection of existing agencies for the administration of justice and better intercourse of the nations. The Permanent Court of International Justice should be restored and made more adaptable for its purpose. It should remain strictly judicial in its functions, entirely independent of diplomacy and politics. The rules of international

law should be adjusted to changing conditions. Law cannot be static in a rapidly changing world order. We should consider the advisability of creating new agencies for international justice, such as a court of claims, a criminal court, and tribunals to facilitate commercial relations.

* * *

We should be planning for the profound readjustments which will be required by the social revolution now sweeping the world and altering the entire structure of international society. Stalin's foreign policy has been based on the eventual revolt of the masses throughout the world. The social system of Great Britain has been radically transformed during the war. France has long faced the probability of a radical regime. The New Deal in the United States is undoubtedly a manifestation of this social revolution. This problem directly concerns the rôle of the International Labor Office in Geneva, which guards the interests of working men in every nation. A revolution which is transforming the whole structure of nations will make it increasingly difficult for governments to conduct foreign relations unless they adjust themselves to the fact of a new social order. A new philosophical and political outlook is bound to dominate international relations when peace comes. If we are not planning intelligently for this new order, it may easily turn into disorder and anarchy. Instead of international wars we may have a general civil war of classes which will cut across frontiers and undermine national political authority. The field of social justice is vast and complicated. It demands immense

good sense and good will. Unless there is sound planning we are in grave danger of internecine quarrels and a general disintegration of international order.

* * *

We must plan to utilize science for the physical well-being, the happiness, and the mental health of the peoples of the world in order to arrest the progressive degeneracy of the human race, which is evidenced alarmingly by statistics concerning malnutrition, disease, insanity, vice, and crime. This will require a high degree of coöperation by scientists and governments. The institute already organized for this purpose by Dr. Alexis Carrel, with the aid of the Vichy Government, may point the way in this untried area of human experimentation.

* * *

We must be planning to create the sound moral and spiritual basis for international understanding, just relations, and true peace. We must do this because human devices for social betterment and justice are of uncertain worth, unless based on spiritual values which enable men to understand, respect, like, and help each other as members of a genuine brotherhood transcending race and creed.

Here is the very heart of the whole problem of peace and order. How can we raise the morale of millions of people exhausted and embittered by oppression, hopelessness, and revengeful hatred? What can be done to give men fresh hope, a new outlook, and the possibility of mutual understanding and confidence? Can we build bridges between peoples full of resent-

ments? Can we reconcile the conflicting desires and passions of men? Can we give them an adequate objective, a real sense of brotherhood and the inspiration of a high destiny?

This need of a moral and spiritual rearmament transcends all other pressing needs. If men cannot surrender selfishness, greed, envy, lust, and hate, there can never be tranquility of order anywhere. We instinctively think that the other fellow must first change his point of view. We are prone to be more concerned about the sins of others than our own. At present we are concerned, and properly so, with the problem presented by the German, Japanese, and Italian mentalities. What chance for international law and order is there when millions of people are actuated by motives of conquest, hate, and the extermination of all who stand in their way? If we were dealing with them as individuals we would sentence them to prison and hard work. We would place them in reformatories in the hope of being able to give them sane, constructive ideas. Military defeat and severe repression will not suffice to change the attitude of a race such as the Germans. They will remain a constant menace to international order so long as their mentalities are unchanged.

To change the mentality of a whole race is not a mass undertaking. It is essentially a personal, individual matter. It is the immediate problem of organized religion, aided by many powerful secular organizations such as the Red Cross, the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A., the Boy and the Girl Scouts, the International Rotary Clubs, and other fraternal bodies working for international friendship and brotherhood.

The most powerful religious body obviously is the Roman Catholic Church, with its highly developed international organization. His Holiness, the Pope—the spiritual father of many nationalities, speaks with immense authority on behalf of those religious principles which alone can bring order and peace. There are also influential Protestant associations and the National Conference of Christians and Jews which are dedicated to this supreme task of bringing men of all races into one brotherhood under one authority.

* * *

These are some of the questions which we must try to answer if we are to be ready to carry on when war shall end. They cannot be easily answered. One thing, however, is perfectly clear; we cannot expect to answer the problems of others when we have not solved our own. If there is any remnant of selfishness, greed, envy, resentments, and hate in ourselves we cannot be of much help to the Germans, Japanese, and Italians. What is demanded of us all is much more than good sense and good will. We need to experience a great moral and spiritual revolution. We must deserve peace before we can win it.

JX1952 .B87
The science of peace
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00141 0028